

Talent ID Rubric

© 2012 IHS Institute

CL Sympathy – This is about both the amount people agree with the Classical Liberal (CL) framework and their likelihood of becoming more CL sympathetic through discussion. Probably our most important metric, most program invitations start with filtering for sympathy.

5 – On board. Broad and strong agreement with the CL framework (markets, property rights, political and economic freedom). Libertarians, anarcho-capitalists, Objectivists, Rothbardians, consequentialists with libertarian conclusions.

4 – Market-friendly. Agrees with many CL ideas (including the power of markets) and is open to new ideas. Inclined to support freedom-enhancing policies though may be inconsistent. Conservatives with principled support for markets.

3 – Open. Agrees with some CL ideas and is open to discussion; sympathy for markets is weak or non-apparent. Open-minded liberals, civil libertarians, or conservatives with weak market support (pro-subsidies, anti-free trade); or someone new to thinking about CL ideas.

2 – Skeptical/Apathetic. Finds little value in CL ideas. Someone who disagrees more than agrees with CL ideas and is open to discussion but is not easily swayed; or doesn't agree or disagree but also doesn't care.

1 – Hostile. Agreement on few if any CL ideas and not open to discussion.

CL Knowledge – An understanding of the concepts, figures, and framework holds more weight than mere exposure to them. It is expected that people will be familiar with most of the examples listed in scores lower than the one they receive. Low CL Knowledge scores will not prevent people from attending IHS programs but will guide program owners to place them into programs appropriate for that knowledge level.

5 – Exceptionally high knowledge. In-depth understanding of CL figures, concepts, and framework, including strong interdisciplinary CL knowledge across more than two fields (economics, philosophy, political science, history). A person at this level of CL knowledge would be ready for participating in and contributing to our most advanced programs.

4 – High knowledge. Familiar with CL figures, concepts, and framework and has an understanding of how they tie together. May be exceptionally knowledgeable in a given field but only somewhat knowledgeable in other fields; or may be knowledgeable across multiple fields but lacks an in-depth understanding of or familiarity with the concepts or figures. May have familiarity with or understanding of (4 or more): Mises, Rothbard, Spooner, Nozick, Buchanan, well-known Liberty Friendly Faculty (Sowell, Caplan, Cowen), spontaneous order, knowledge problem, institutional analysis, opportunity cost, comparative advantage, marginal utility, law vs. legislation, common law, public choice theory, deontology vs. consequentialism, or social contract vs. evolution.

3 – Somewhat knowledgeable. Familiar with CL figures, concepts, and framework and has a basic understanding of how they tie together. May have familiarity with or understanding of (4 or more): Hayek, Milton Friedman, Bastiat, Adam Smith, incentives, trade/exchange, rule of law, rights, morality, or justice.

2 – Low knowledge. Scarcely familiar with CL figures, concepts, or framework. May be familiar with figures or concepts but lacks an understanding of how they tie together into a larger framework; or may be familiar with a basic liberty framework but is not familiar with many figures or concepts. May have cursory familiarity with: Ron Paul, Ayn Rand, John Locke, JS Mill, Tea Party, or the Founding Fathers.

1 – Exceptionally low knowledge. Not at all familiar with CL figures, concepts, or framework. Confuses figures or concepts or doesn't know of them in the first place.

Career Direction – Serious intent and future plans are weighted more than current career stage. This metric is important for funneling participants into the appropriate programs and for ensuring we are prioritizing our investment efforts on students more likely to enter one of our supported careers. Supportable careers include: academia (humanities and social sciences, especially economics, philosophy, political science, history), public policy, ideological nonprofit, public interest law, politics, k-12 education, journalism/new media, creative/fiction writing, film/tv production, or publishing.

5 – Definitely supportable. There is no doubt that this person will be in this supportable career for the long-term. Established in their career with no intent to change paths. Academia: a late stage PhD student with strong intent to become an academic; or an established faculty member. Public interest law: working in the field.

4 – Supportable. In an internship or applying to jobs in a supported field; early career. Academia: applying to grad school; early grad school. Public interest law: already in law school with public interest law plan and has internship or clerkship; or applying to jobs in the field.

3 – Undecided. A supportable career is possible but the person is still deciding; or has no idea what they want to end up doing; or has interests but hasn't taken any serious steps towards the intended career. Academia: interested but hasn't picked field or grad programs. Public interest law: interested but hasn't picked law programs; or a current law student with interest but no actions made in this direction.

2 – Not supportable. In an internship or applying to jobs in an unsupported field; early career. Academia (unsupported field): applying to grad school; early grad school. Law (not public interest): applying to law school or already in law school with serious intent on this direction; or applying to jobs in the field.

1 – Definitely not supportable. There is no doubt that this person will be in this unsupportable career for the long-term. Established in their career with no intent to change paths. Academia (unsupported field): a late stage PhD student with strong intent to become an academic; or an established faculty member. Law (not public interest): working in the field.

IHS Values – This measures a person's moral character as relevant to working with others, specifically IHS. This score indicates IHS's willingness to put its credibility on the line in recommending this person to future IHS programs and/or allies. This is used as a catch-all for signaling any undesirable personality traits with low scores or highly desirable personality traits with high scores.

5 – Exceptionally high values. History of undeniable trustworthiness and reliability; humble, non-dogmatic; would not hesitate to recommend.

4 – High values. History of demonstrating good values at multiple programs and with multiple staff.

3 – Average values. Limited evidence based on few interactions; or nothing particularly good or bad that stands out.

2 – Low values. Suspect. Limited evidence of low values based on few interactions. Still willing to give the person a chance but may prioritize this person lower than someone with no value score. Would hesitate to recommend.

1 – Exceptionally low values. Dishonorable. Unreliable, dishonest, verbal/physical abuse, significant misconduct. Would recommend against. This person should be marked Inactive – Internal and have no further relationship or communication with IHS.

Intellectual/Creative Ability – This metric is unique in that it should be thought of as relative to others in the person's cohort (age group, career stage, or career type). This is important for inviting top tier participants to more intensive programs and for prioritizing investments in people whose raw ability makes them more likely to succeed in their career.

5 – Exceptionally high ability. Superstar. Has demonstrated exceptional intellect, creativity, and insight; very likely to make a mark in the world. Undeniably investment-worthy.

4 – High ability. Talented. Very likely to succeed. Investment-worthy.

3 – Average ability. Still has potential to succeed. Nothing significant stands out as particularly high or low ability. Potentially worth investment.

2 – Low ability. Subpar. Aptitude necessary to succeed is noticeably low. Likely not worth investment.

1 – Exceptionally low ability. Nonstarter. Lacking in raw firepower. Not worth investment.

Communication Skills – This measures a person's ability to communicate ideas and to persuade an audience both on paper and in person. This is important for identifying people, particularly future faculty, who are great communicators.

5 – Exceptionally high communication skills. Excellent. Has demonstrated outstanding skills. Writing fit for publication and a compelling/persuasive speaker.

4 – High communication skills. Above average in both writing and speaking skills; or excellent in one but unsure on the other.

3 – Average communication skills. Decent writing and/or speaking skills. Nothing significant stands out as particularly high or low communication skills.

2 – Low communication skills. Writing or speaking difficult to follow; unpersuasive, error-prone, or subpar English skills.

1 – Exceptionally low communication skills. Incoherent writing or speaking.

Confidence Level – Rate your own confidence in the scores you have just given. This has a longitudinal component and should reflect your confidence in your scores based on the intensity of the interaction, the number of interactions you've had in the past, and the amount of time you have known this individual.

Confidence Level is critically important because it determines which evaluation gets pulled from a person record when scores are being pulled into a list for emails, program invitations, or reporting purposes. Please score responsibly.

5 – Several consistent firsthand interactions. Exceptionally high confidence. Corroborating impressions across several months, programs, or staff evaluations. May include a person you worked closely with for 3+ months, a person you have corresponded with on several occasions, or a person who multiple staff have corresponded with on multiple occasions. You could not get any more confident in your scores and you are absolutely certain they accurately reflect the person.

4 – Multiple firsthand interactions. High confidence. Corroborating impressions across multiple intensive programs or staff evaluations. You are mostly certain your scores accurately reflect the person but haven't had enough consistent interactions to be 100% confident.

3 – Strong firsthand interactions. Confident. Strong, consistent impressions from several people or thorough in-person conversations. May include several thorough interactions at a summer seminar.

2 – Firsthand interaction. Somewhat confident. Impression from one program or in-person exchange. May include an in-depth conversation at an event.

1 – Limited or secondhand interaction. Low confidence. Evaluation extrapolated from applications, brief conversations, online interactions, or secondhand information.